DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 834 UD 010 531

AUTHOR Helms, Lelia
TITLE Final Report. Survey of Penfield School District Residents' Reactions to the Penfield-Rochester Transfer Program.
PUB DATE Jul 70
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bus Transportation, *Community Support, Integration Methods, *Parent Attitudes, Parent Reaction, Restrictive Transfer Programs, *School Integration, Social Attitudes, Suburban Schools, Suburban Youth, *Transfer Programs, Transfer Students, Urban Schools, Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This report is based on results from a panel study of residents of Penfield, N.Y., a community instituting a suburban-urban transfer with the City School District of Rochester in September 1968. Two interviews were conducted in September 1968 and in June 1969 with the same respondents: a random sample of district resident, a random sample of parents and school district elites. Results indicate consistent and general support of about 50 percent of the total for the program among all three samples. However, opposition increased over the period studied by a very slight amount to about 30-35 percent of the total. Little real polarization appears to have taken place among respondents contrary to expectations. In the community in general the transfer program is not a controversial issue and has received little attention in the newspapers. At present the transfer program continues to function smoothly although the potential for dissent within the community is latent. [Not available in hard copy due to the marginal legibility of the original document.] (Author/JM)

ED042834

FINAL REPORT:

SURVEY OF PENFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT RESIDENTS' REACTIONS TO THE PENFIELD-ROCHESTER TRANSFER PROGRAM

UD010531

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

submitted to:
Dr. Carl Wedekind
July, 1970

by:
Dr. Lelia Helms
Dept. of Political Science
S.U.C. at Brockport
Brockport, N.Y.

ED042834

ABSTRACT

The following report is based on results from a panel study of residents of Penfield, N.Y., a community instituting a suburban-urban transfer with the City School District of Rochester in September 1968. Two interviews were conducted in September 1968 and in June 1969 with the same respondents: a random sample of district resident, a random sample of parents and school district elites. Results indicate consistent and general support of about 50% of the total for the program among all three smaples. However, opposition increased over the period studied by a very slight amount to about 30-35% of the total. Little real polarization appears to have taken place among respondents contrary to expectations. In the community in general the transfer program is not a controversial issue and has received little attention in the newspapers. At present the transfer program continues to function smoothly although the potential for dissent within the community is latent.

I. Introduction

Suburban-urban transfer programs offer city students the opportunity to participate in suburban educational programs. Presently such transfer programs operate in the Boston, Hartford and Rochester metropolitan areas. Data from these programs is gradually being gathered and can provide additional aid in planning and implementing successful school integration. A vital component in the future success of integration programs is the reaction of the community. Little empirical evidence about community attitudes and patterns of reaction to integration is available in the literature. This survey attempts to explore the long-term attitudes and reactions of a suburban school district participating in a suburban-urban transfer program.

Penfield, an upper middle class, suburban community, instituted a cooperative transfer program with the city school district of Rochester, N.Y., in September 1968. Thirty-one city students enrolled in 3 Penfield elementary schools. In order to study community attitudes and reaction to the program an initial series of interviews was conducted with Penfield residents in September 1968 and reported in April 1969.* The same respondents were re-interviewed in June 1969 after the program's first full year of operation. These results were reported in February 1970.** To follow is a summary and final report of the findings of the Penfield surveys.

---

* Preliminary Report on the Survey of Penfield School District Residents' Reactions to the Penfield-Rochester Transfer Program, April 1969, L. Helms, SUC at Brockport.

** Progress Report: Penfield School District's Reactions to the Penfield-Rochester Transfer Program, February 1970, L. Helms, SUC at Brockport

A. Sample

Data is based on a panel study consisting of two interviews conducted with the same respondents in September 1968 and June 1969. Three categories of respondents were interviewed: a random sample of school district residents selected at large; a random sample of parents with children in the newly integrated classrooms and school district 'elites' arbitrarily defined as school board members and school parent-teacher organization officials.

Studies based on the repeated interviewing of the same group of respondents face the problem of attrition. Response to the Penfield survey dropped 20% between the first and second rounds.

Sample	Round #1	Round #2	Number dropped	% dropped
At large	113	88	25	22.1%
Parents	44	33	11	25%
Elites	19	19	-	-
Total	176	140	36	20.4%

The reasons for this drop included:

Reason	At large	Parent
Refused during the first interview to permit a second interview.....	5	2
Refused at the time of the second interview to be interviewed again.....	2	2
Moved from the Penfield school district.....	6	0
On vacation, couldn't be reached.....	4	2
No contact although several attempts.....	5	4
Other.....	3	1
Total.....	25	11

Analysis of the group dropping out of the survey after the first round indicates that these respondents were predominantly opposed to, or at least ambivalent toward, the transfer program. When the socio-economic data for this group (those dropping out) was analysed, no clear pattern emerged. No real differences existed between those who answered both surveys and those answering only the first in occupational

status, age distribution or number of years residing in the Penfield school district. Only educational attainment revealed some differences between groups. Those dropping from the at large group were insignificantly distributed among all levels of educational achievement. There were no drops from the elite sample. However, for the parent sample all drops occurred from those respondents with a high School education or less. This may indicate: first, that these respondents clearly associated the survey with the school; second, that this group, being the group most directly involved with the schools and the program, was most reluctant to be counted; and third, that the social desirability of educational attainment and consequent feeling of inadequacy in the interview situation was strongest for this group. From hereonin all data presented for round#1 will not include those refusing for any reason a second interview.

In sum, the reasons for respondents' dropping out of the survey are varied. Those dropping were predominantly opposed to the program. Here the influence of factors of social desirability must be mentioned. The heavily negative distribution of respondents' dropping may reflect respondent awareness of the social desirability of appearing to favor integration and integration programs and a consequent unwillingness to violate these norms despite real opposition. This argument is supported by the generally high levels of educational attainment and occupational status of Penfield residents.

B. Background data

Penfield is an upper middle class suburban community. This is confirmed by the background data gathered from respondents in the school district.* 74% if the respondents report some education beyond high

---

* For additional information see appendix A .

school with 50% having completed college and 21.5% of the men holding advanced degrees. Penfield is one of the wealthier suburbs in the Rochester metropolitan area with yearly income averaging over $14,000. Survey results indicate that 83% of respondents earn over $10,000 yearly and 49% over 15,000. By occupation 65% claim technical, professional or managerial status while an additional 20% are self-employed or in sales. District residents are mobile as 62% have lived in Penfield less than 8 years. The district is child populous with only 4 respondents reporting no children at all and 25, no children currently enrolled in the Penfield schools. Concommitantly, the age distribution of respondents is concentrated in the 30-49 bracket. To summarize, Penfield typifies a suburban, familistic population with much higher than average levels of income and education.

II.. Results

Attitudes are composed of a complex set of interrelated and interreactive beliefs, experience and personality factors. The affect of attitudes upon behavior is uncertain. The present study attempts only to characterize respondent's attitueds toward integration and the transfer program during its first year of operation. To this end it is necessary to distinguish between respondents' views of the Penfield schools, the school integration issue in general and finally the Penfield-Rochester transfer program specifically.

A. Attitudes toward the Penfield schools

Respondents were asked to compare the Penfield schools with other school systems in Monroe County. The response indicates generally positive views of the Penfield schools. This finding confirms data gathered in a 1967 survey of the district to determine general levels

of community support for the schools.*

How would you rank Penfield schools against other school systems in Monroe County?

	Best in county	One of best	Average	Somewhat below average	Poor	Other, No children
Total.....	15.4%	69.8%	6.4%	0.7%	0.7%	6.5%
At large.....	18.0	61.8	4.5	1.1	1.1	13.4
Parents.....	12.5	68.8	9.4	-	-	6.2
Elites.....	15.8	78.9	5.3	-	-	- **

Upon probing into specific components of attitudes towards the schools respondents seemed unable to make meaningful distinctions between features of the program offered by the Penfield schools. Most held either a generally consistent, positive or negative view of the schools. Thus, respondents felt that the type of family living in the district, the facilities, the teaching staff, the administration and the curriculum all contributed positively to the quality of education in Penfield. Even the key question asking the respondent to evaluate spending by the school district demonstrated some satisfaction with current levels of spending.

Evaluation of school district spending

	Spends too much money	Spends just about right amount	Spends too little money	Other
Total.....	23.7%	58.6%	9.3%	8.6%
At large.....	25.8	57.3	6.7	10.2
Parents.....	31.3	56.3	3.1	9.3
Elites.....	--	68.4	31.6	-

In another measure respondents were given a list of issues frequently mentioned in relation to the schools and asked to select the two items which they perceived as the most important issues facing the Penfield schools. The results follow.

---

* 1967 Report, Penfield Central School District, p. 12.

** Errors due to rounding in this and all following tables.

Item	Most important issue	Rank Order	Second most important issue	Rank Order
Maintaining high educational standards	34.3%	1	16.4%	2
Limiting the amount of money spent on the schools	19.3	2	13.6	3
Communication between the schools and district residents	11.4	3	17.9	1
Overcrowding	10.0	4	4.3	5
Increasing the amount of money spent on the schools	9.3	5	4.3	5
Too many frills	5.0	6	6.4	4
Maintaining discipline in the classroom	3.6	7	13.6	3
Increasing the educational services offered by the schools, such as guidance, language, etc.	2.9	8	17.9	1
The Penfield-Rochester transfer program	2.9	8	2.9	6

When analysed by sample, some distinctions emerge. All three samples view maintaining high educational standards as both the first and second most important isues with one exception: at large group, second choice. Clearly in the measure, the Penfield-Rochester transfer program consistently ranks lowest both as a first and second choice by respondents.

Sample	Most important issue	Second in importance
Elite	#1 Maintaining high standards (36.8%) #2 Communication (26.3%) #3 Increasing money spent (15.8%)	#1 Maintaining high standards (36.8%) #2 Increasing services (26.3%) #3 (3-way tie, 10.5% each) Limiting money Increasing money Maintaining discipline
Parent	#1 Maintaining high standards (33.3%) #2 Limiting money spent (21.2%) #3 Communication (15.2%)	#1 Maintaining high standards (21.1%) #2 Maintaining discipline (18,2%) #3 (3-way tie, 12.1%each) Limiting money Communication Increasing services
At large	#1 Maintaining high standards (34.1%) #2 Limiting money (21.6%) #3 Overcrosding (10.2%)	#1 Communication (22.7%) #2 Increasing services (18.2) #3 Limiting money (14.8%)

Asecond area of questions dealing with views about the schools dealt with respondents' satisfaction with information supplied to them about the schools. First the respondent was asked if he were satisfied with the information he received about the schools. Most indicated some satisfaction.

	Too much information	Enough information	Not enouch information
Total	1.4%	69.3%	29.3%
At large.....	2.3	65.9	31.3
Parents	-	78.8	21.2
Elite.....	-	68.4	31.6

This question was then related to the question of participation in district affairs. Respondents were asked about their participation in the three school elections during the 1968-69 school year.

Did you vote in the.....

Bond Election (2/69)

	Yes	No	Other
Total.....	68.6%	27.1%	4.3%
At large.....	69.3	29.5	1.1
Parent.....	51.5	33.3	15.2
Elite.....	94.7	5.3	-

Budget Election (6/69)

	Yes	No	Other
Total.....	65%	32.9%	2.1%
At large.....	64.8	34.1	1.1
Parent.....	45.5	48.5	6.1
Elite.....	100.0		

School Board Elections (6/69)

	Yes	No	Other
Total.....	68.6%	30.0%	1.4%
At large.....	64.8	35.2	-
Parent	42.4	51.5	6.1
Elite.....	94.7	5.3	-

These figures are exceedingly high when compared to the district average for these elections (30-40% of the total eligible, in fact, did vote) and must be viewed with suspition. Social desirability in a

face -to-face interview with a well educated population may have been a key factor in producing this result. When analysed by sample the parent group consistently reports a 15% lower level of voting participation than the total. Elite group participation ranges between 95-100% in each election. The at large figures seem high and inconsistent with the idea that greater direct involvement with school affairs leads to greater participation as reflected in voting turnout. The high at large turnout may, in fact, reflect norms of social desirability and bear little relation to actual fact, for, as a group voting turnout would be expected to be the lowest in the at large group. The lower parental participation may reflect a more honest and accurate response.

Finally, the issue of school-community communication was raised with the question: did the school district give you enough information prior to each of these elections? The response to this was slightly more favorable than to the previous, more general question about communication.

Did you receive enough information prior to each of these elections?

	Yes	No	Other
Total.....	75%	21.4%	3.5%
At large.....	75.0	22.7	2.2
Parents.....	69.7	21.1	9.1
Elites	84.2	15.8	-

When respondents were asked to specify for which of the three elections there was insufficient information 75% of the total again repeated their general satisfaction. Another 5% of the total felt that the district was at fault in providing information for all three elections. However, of the remainder, the bond election seemed to

evoke the least satisfaction with 8.6% indicating lack of communication by the district on that issue alone. Only 2%, respectively, indicated that the budget and board election information programs were deficient. This rather tentative difference is reinforced, however, by events in the district: the bond issue was defeated three times; the budget passed easily the first time both in 1969 and 1970.

B. Attitudes towards school integration

Attitudes related to questions of race are complex. Much of the literature about racial attitudes reports increased support for the idea of school integration in this country.* However, these results must be viewed with suspicion. Instead, it may well be the case that racial prejudice has become socially unacceptable at the verbal level today, particularly in groups with high levels of education. Despite allegedly high levels of support for school integration little meaningful school integration has taken place in the north. In fact, when concrete programs of school integration are developed strong opposition has usually served to limit them. Thus, the problem remains of understanding the relationship between attitudes and behavior in situations involving actual school integration.

In this survey an attempt was made to distinguish between generalized attitudes toward school integration as dictated by the norms of social desirability and between meaningful attitudes towards school integration as dictated by reactions to a concrete and immediate program establishing actual schod integration. As expected Penfield residents report strong general support for the idea of school integration. As questions become more specific and related to actual

situations social distance narrows and support for meaningful school integration decreases. In fact, attitudes towards school integration may be meaningfully measured only in terms of concrete and personal situations and not in generalized and abstract terms.

A group of general questions about school integration was posed to respondents in both rounds. The purpose of these questions was to establish with increasing specificity the spectrum of respondents' attitudes from general opinions about school integration to views of a functioning integration program. Thus, respondents were asked if they favored school integration. Few said no with the parent group again the most opposed as their involvement is potentially greatest.

Is the integration of Negro and White children in school desirable?

	Yes	No	Other
Total.....	85.7%	5.7%	8.6%
At large.....	86.5	3.4	10.1
Parents.....	81.3	12.5	6.3
Elite.....	90.0	5.0	5.0

The next three questions, repeated in both interviews, become increasingly specific about problems encountered in the process of integrating suburban schools. The results reflect respondent skepticism as social distance narrows and as the questions become more applicable to the Penfield-Rochester transfer program. The results reflect some change between the September and June interview.

Do you favor educating city students together with suburban students?

		Yes	No	Other
Total.....	September.....	66.4%	22.1%	11.4%
	June.....	60.0	28.6	11.4
At large..	September.....	62.9	22.5	14.6
	June.....	55.7	28.4	15.9

	September	68.8	25.0	6.3
Parents...	June	60.1	36.4	3.0
	September	79.0	16.0	5.0
Elite.....	June	79.0	16.0	5.0

Should Negro and White children go to school together even when they don't live in the same neighborhood or come from the same town ?

		Yes	No	Other
	September...	60.7%	34.3%	5.0%
Total.....	June.....	53.6	33.6	12.8
	September...	55.1	39.3	5.6
At large...	June.....	50.0	37.5	12.5
	September...	65.6	34.4	-
Parents....	June.....	51.5	33.3	15.2
	September...	79.0	10.5	10.5
Elite.....	June.....	73.7	15.8	5.3

Are programs busing innercity students to suburban schools desirable?

		Yes	No	Other
	September...	52.8%	37.1%	10.0%
Total.....	June.....	55.0%	36.4%	8.5%
	September...	49.4	37.1	13.5
At large..	June.....	52.3	38.6	9.1
	September...	53.1	43.8	3.1
Parents...	June.....	51.5	39.4	9.1
	September...	69.0	26.0	5.0
Elite.....	June.....	73.7	21.1	5.3

To summarize these findings:

1. Respondents are less positive as the question becomes more specific.
2. Some change in attitude is perceptible between September 1968 and June 1969.
3. This change seems to be focusing at the 55% level of support and 35% level of opposition. Residents may be associating the first two more theoretical questions with the practical in that the answers to all three in June are closer together.
4. The question of busing is the only one to show a slight increase in support.

Finally respondents were asked about their satisfaction with the rate of school integration.

In your view is school integration proceeding.....

		much too fast	rapidly	at just about the right speed	too slowly	at a stand-still	other
Total	Sept.....	5.7%	5.7%	41.4%	35.7%	2.8%	8.6%
	June.....	7.1	7.1	32.1	37.0	9.3	7.2
At large	Sept...	5.6	4.5	41.6	34.8	3.4	10.0
	June...	8.0	10.2	31.8	34.1	10.2	5.7
Parent	Sept....	9.4	15.6	50.0	21.9	-	3.1
	June....	9.1	3.0	39.4	36.4	6.1	6.0
Elite	Sept....	-	-	26.3	63.1	5.2	5.2
	June....	-	-	21.1	52.6	10.5	15.8

To summarize these findings:

1. Generally between September and June there was an increased polarization of opinion on this question.
2. The largest shift in opinion was in the direction of school integration being too slow.
3. Interestingly the parental sample registered the largest, also the most positive shift, in opinion.
4. In all samples there was a significant decrease in satisfaction with present rates of progress.

In order to summarize respondents' attitudes towards school integration a scale was constructed based on the preceeding questions plus on the respondent's answers to several open-ended questions. Generally, respondents attitudes twoards school integration could be characterized according to the following scale..

Attitudes towards integration

	Generally positive	Ambivalent	Generally negative
Total.....	50%	26.4%	23.5%
At large.....	49.5	26.9	23.6
Parents.....	40.7	28.1	31.3
Elite.....	68.4	21.0	10.5

C. Attitudes towards the Penfield-Rochester transfer program

After establishing attitudes toward school integration from the general to the specific, it was possible to examine attitudes towards the Penfield-Rochester transfer program. Here again a variety of questions was asked to incorporate as many aspects of the program as possible.

Interestingly the pattern of general satisfaction with school-community communications reverses itself when the transfer program is mentioned. Satisfaction with information about the transfer program seems to be related, in part, to the degree of direct involvement in the schools.

Busing program information

	too much	enough	not enough	other
Total.....	-	22.1%	75.0%	2.9%
At large.....	-	14.8	82.9	2.3
Parents.....	-	30.3	66.7	3.0
Elite.....	-	42.1	52.6	5.3

A series of questions about the Penfield-Rochester transfer program was repeated in both interviews in order to compare any differences in responses over the nine month interval. In the first two questions a relatively similar pattern of increasing ambivalence emerges as those openly skeptical remain constant while those initially positive decrease. Here the parent group is the most stable with major shifts in the at large group.

In your view is the program....

		educationally sound	educationally unsound	neither, other
Total.....	September...	60.7%	13.6%	25.7%
	June.....	41.4	12.9	45.7

	September...	62.9%	13.5%	23.6%
At large....	June.....	35.2	13.6	51.1
	September...	50.0	18.8	31.3
Parents.....	June.....	45.5	18.2	36.3
	September...	68.4	5.3	26.3
Elite.....	June.....	63.2	-	36.9

In your view is the program.....

		socially desirable	socially undesirable	neither, other
	September...	71.4%	10.7%	17.9%
Total.....	June.....	55.0	10.0	35.0
	September...	70.8	11.2	18.0
At large...	June.....	48.9	12.5	38.6
	September...	65.6	15.6	18.8
Parents....	June.....	66.7	6.1	27.3
	September...	84.2	-	15.8
Elite.....	June.....	63.2	5.3	31.6

A third question elicited a much more stable response pattern. Here the greatest shifts occur in the parental group.

In your view is the program a step in the.....

		right direction	wrong direction	neither, other
	September...	65.0%	13.6%	21.0%
Total.....	June.....	62.1	13.6	24.2
	September...	64.0	12.4	19.1
At large...	June.....	61.4	14.8	23.8
	September...	56.3	25.0	18.8
Parents....	June.....	63.6	15.2	21.2
	September...	84.2	-	15.8
Elite.....	June.....	63.2	5.2	31.6

These results in sum indicate an increased ambivalence about the educational valicity and social desirability of the program. This ambivalence may be based on either real uncertainty about the program or on an increased sophistication and conomitant reluctance to accede to simple answers. The latter reason might explain the relatively

constant distribution of responses to the third question of whether the program is a step in the right or wrong direction. Here respondents may perceive the answer as requiring a simple opinion response whereas the first two questions may appear to a sophisticated population as requiring a response based on knowledge rather than opinion. Hypothetically, with increasing exposure to integration problems comes increasing knowledge and unwillingness to reply to a complicated question framed in deceptive terms. Thus the differences in response to this series of questions may reside in the structure of the questions.

In June the respondents were asked if they favored continuation of the program for another year. 60% supported continuation; 27.1% opposed it; 12.8% felt unable to reply. When asked about the number of city students participating, 30.7% favored increasing the number while 16.4% favored a decrease or complete elimination. Of the remaining respondents 38.6% felt that the number should be kept constant and the remaining 14.3% had no opinion.

Much of the debate about such suburban-urban transfer programs has focused on the demands for voter approval. This demand has been voiced in several area suburbs debating instituting such programs by groups primarily opposed to such transfer programs. Thus, the question of what format of approval for the transfer program should be used in Penfield was posed.

Should the program be	Total	At large	Parents	Elite
a permanent and regular feature of the district's program.....	6.4%	4.5%	6.1%	15.8%
subject to yearly renewal by district officials.....	52.1	52.3	48.5	57.9
voted on as a condition of its renewal.....	32.1	34.1	36.4	15.8
discontinued now.....	7.1	8.0	6.1	5.3
other.....	2.1	1.1	3.0	5.3

An attempt was made to determine the willingness of residents to assume some of the costs of the program. To date most of the costs of the program have been borne by the state and city. Given the budget ary problems facing area districts generally and the consecutive bond defeats suffered by the Penfield district the question of financing the program was expected to be controversial. The response gives some indication of the degree of community commitment to the program.

If other funds were not available would you

strongly approve.....16.4%
mildly approve.....15.7
uncertain.....12.1
mildly oppose.....16.4
strongly oppose.....38.6
other..... 0.7

of the Penfield school district's paying for

all of..... 5.7%
most of..... 5.0
part of.....38.6
none of.....43.6
don't know..... 7.2

the costs of the transfer program.

In another approach respondents were given a self-rating scale and asked to rank their views of the program both at its inception in September and at present, June 1969.

		strongly approve	mildly approve	undecided	mildly opposed	strongly opposed	other
Total...	Sept.....	27.1%	26.4%	10.7%	15.7%	15.0%	5.0%
	June.....	25.0	29.3	7.1	21.4	15.7	1.4
At large.	Sept.....	25.0	28.4	12.5	13.6	15.9	4.5
	June.....	22.7	29.5	8.0	20.4	17.0	2.2
Parent...	Sept.....	18.2	24.2	12.1	24.2	18.2	3.0
	June.....	15.2	33.3	6.1	27.3	18.2	-
Elite....	Sept.....	52.6	21.1	-	10.5	5.3	10.6
	June.....	52.6	21.1	5.3	15.8	5.3	-

When evaluating themselves 78% of the respondents report no changes in attitudes between September and June. Of the remaining 22%, 3.6% report a shift from previously positive or negative views to an undecided position while 10.7% report having made up their minds either positively of negatively from a previously undecided view.

When the self rating scale is compared to the general summary scales in both rounds, significant differences appear in attitudes towards the program. Each respondent's views toward the program were summarized at the end of each interview. The results follow below.

Attitudes towards the transfer program

		strongly approve	mildly approve	undecided	mildly oppose	strongly oppose	other
Total	Sept.....	23.6%	26.4%	14.3%	15.7%	19.3%	0.7%
	June.....	18.6	29.3	14.3	11.4	26.4	-
At large	Sept.....	21.3	25.8	15.7	15.7	20.2	1.1
	June.....	13.6	32.9	12.6	11.4	28.4	-
Parent	Sept.....	21.9	25.0	6.3	25.0	21.9	-
	June.....	21.2	18.2	21.2	15.2	24.2	-
Elite	Sept.....	36.8	31.5	21.0	-	10.5	-
	June.....	36.8	30.6	5.3	5.3	21.2	-

These results indicate:

1. In no case was there an increase in general support of the program.
2. In all cases except the parent sample there was an increase in opposition to the program.
3. All samples except the parent sample showed decreased ambivalence about the program.
4. The parent sample demonstrates a marked increase in uncertainty about the program.
5. The overall shift in attitudes was quite small (2^{+}%).

When the self-rating measure is compared with the summary scales some interesting observations can be made.

1. In general the pattern of the self-rating scale parallels that of the summary scales.
2. Respondents when evaluating themselves are consistently more positive in their self-ranking than when respondents are ranked by the coder in the summary scale. This is true in every case except for the parent sample.
3. The factor of social desirability in a face-to-face interview probably places a premium on the respondents holding some opinion. Lack of information, and consequently an opinion, about the program could not serve as readily as a dodge in the second round interview with the same respondents.

To summarize, during the first year of the Penfield-Rochester transfer program there has been an insignificant decrease in support for the program. In general the program has a strong base of support as indicated by the 50% level of support. There is considerable opposition to the porgram, however. The key to the program's continued functioning seems to lie in those who are ambivalent. There seems to have been little increase in polarization over the program during its first year.

D. Reasons for attitudes towards the program

In the first round interview several open-ended questions were posed in order to ascertain the reasons for respondents attitudes towards the program. In addition each respondent was asked to rank a series of factors as contributing in a major, minor or in no way to their particular view of the program. The list of factors was drawn from those commonly mentioned in the literature about busing programs. The results follow in decreasing order of strength.

Motivational factors behind transfer program
(round #1)

The program is....	major factor	minor factor	no factor
preparation for getting along in interracial situations.....	65.0%	30.7%	3.6%
a means of intercultural enrichment for students.....	66.4	23.6	9.3
a concession to the Negro community.....	22.1	47.1	28.6
a result of popular desire for such a program by Penfield residents.....	20.7	35.0	45.0
a way to help the city students out of a predicament.....	15.7	28.6	52.9
the result of political pressure from the city.....	15.0	26.4	47.9
to help the city schools out of a bind.....	12.1	28.6	59.3
a move by the Penfield school administration to gain state or federal aid.....	9.3	15.7	63.0
a move by the Penfield school administration to gain attention.....	3.6	21.4	73.6

In sum, there is a very clear pattern of response. An almost perfect correlation exists between major and no factors inversely. In addition positive factors are overwhelmingly emphasized as there is a large gap between factors two and three. This again may be attributed to social desirability as respondents seem anxious to say something positive. A similar pattern is indicated in the results of the second round of interviews to strengthen these conclusions.

In the second round a similar measure was employed. First a list of possible advantages and benefits of the program and then a list of possible objections or disadvantages were given to the respondent to rank. Both lists were carefully compiled from a frequency count and anlysis of responses to all open-ended questions in the first round interview. The results follow in decreasing order of strength.

Motivational factors behind transfer program - positive reasons (round #2)

The program	major factor	minor factor	no factor	other
represents an interim step. It is one of the alternatives available in trying to solve the problem.....	61.4%	24.3%	8.6%	5.7%
expands the students' socialand cultural horizons.....	59.3	27.9	9.3	3.6
helps to prevent prejudice, teaches that color makes no difference.....	55.0	23.6	16.4	5.0
leads to further steps in promoting integration.....	52.8	26.7	12.1	9.3
Suburban children need interracial experience and school is the best place to acquire it.....	51.4	26.4	17.1	5.0
will rub off on adults and increase adult concern for the race crisis...	42.1	25.0	25.0	7.1
helps to prepare students for real life situations.....	37.1	30.0	24.3	8.6
is one way to help the Negro out of his predicament.....	32.9	30.7	28.6	7.8
is the democratic thing to do.....	27.1	22.9	40.0	10.0
will help promote residential integration in Penfield.....	22.1	27.1	37.1	18.6

Analysis:

1. Again there is an almost perfect inverse correlation between decending major and ascending no factors.

2. Five of the reasons reach a 50+% level as major reasons for supporting the program.

3. None of the reasons reach the 50+% level as no reason for their particular reaction to the program.

4. Response at the level of minor reason varies only by 6%.

5. In summary, there seems to be a desire to appear supportive of the program in some way or another; despite real opposition respondents felt compelled to find some good points about it.

Motivational factors behind the transfer program-
negative reasons (round #2)

The program	major factor	minor factor	no factor	other
You should spend money on the city schools first	47.1%	15.7%	27.9%	9.3%
It's an artificial solution, should go to neighborhood school	45.0	22.9	25.7	6.4
City students would be happier in their own neighborhood schools	28.6	22.1	27.9	21.4
Program is experimental. Wait until more is known	28.6	21.4	40.7	9.3
It's the city's problem. Let them solve it	26.3	17.9	51.4	7.1
Busing students is harmful to them	23.6	26.4	40.0	10.0
Placing city students in suburban schools will be educationally and psychologically traumatic for them	22.1	26.4	38.6	12.8
Will tend to increase Penfield school taxes	19.3	27.1	38.6	15.0
Let the city people work their way up the economic ladder the way we did	19.3	12.7	63.6	5.0
Program was forced upon Penfield residents, no other alternatives	14.3	19.0	50.0	16.4
Reduces the quality of education in the Penfield schools	8.6	25.0	63.6	2.8
Divides up the community and turns people against each other	5.7	15.7	69.8	9.3

Analysis:

1. No reason is mentioned by 50% of respondents as a major disadvantage of the program in contrast with the response to the positive factors where five reached this level.
2. Inversely, five reasons are mentioned by 50% of respondents as no disadvantage of the program in contrast with the positive factors where no reason attains this level.
3. There is a rough inverse correlation between descending major and ascending no factors.
4. In summary, there is a reluctance to appear to be negative about the program.

In both rounds a clear pattern of reasoning emerges. Respondents are much more willing to reveal positive rather than negative factors of their views about the program. This again may reflect an element of social desirability. On the other hand it may reveal a general support-

iveness for the program. Finally, the reasons mentioned by Penfield residents for support and opposition tothe program do not differ greatly from those mentioned in the literature concerning suburban-urban transfer programs.

E..Summary of findings

It seems clear that the Penfield-Rochester transfer enjoys substantial support within the Penfield school district. Both the first and second studeis confirm this. Those consistently indicating support for the program constitute 45-50% of those interviewed while those opposed constitute 35-40%. This conclusion is supported by events within the district as the transfer program was almost a non-existent issue in discussions of town and district affairs.

Over the period measured, contrary to expectations, no significant polarization occurred in attitudes towards the program. However, generally, the results do indicate slightly increased opposition to the program. This trend has not become evident in district affairs and may reflect only pecularities within the sameple. Yet, a factor which cannot be overlooked is the positive bias introduced into the second round results by the 20% sample drop. Those respondents who dropped were generally more opposed to the program. Dropping seems to be strongly related to factors of social desirability.

The most interesting respondent group is the parents. Of all the samples it records the greatest variability. Perhaps this is due to the high degree of direct involvement in the program with the effects of the program being most clearly registered by this sample. Parents in equal numbers record both decreasing support for and opposition to the program and a 15% increase in uncertainty. This tendency of the

parent sample to demonstrate the greatest 'swing' is evident in the results of most questions. Although evidencing some change, the results of the elite sample are less variable and significant due to the small size (N=19) of the sample. These results indicate, in part, that interracial contact has some impact upon attitudes although not necessarily a positive impact in terms of respondent evaluation of the program.

Finally, it seems clear that attitudes towards problems of race become more polarized as questions become less abstract and more personal. This is clearly demonstrated in the spectrum of answers to questions dealing with the idea of school integration generally to the transfer program specifically. The former receives the greates support; the latter, the least. Furthermore, parents as the group most directly affected by the question of school integration are the least positive throughout the spectrum of questions. Responses indicate that a meaningful measure of racial attitudes towards school integration are best elicited when situations calling for some behavioral response are presented to respondents. This is particularly true in survey work with well-educated and highly sophisticated suburban populations where factors of social desirability are far moe prevalent and complex.

In Penfield the success of the transfer program will depend upon the relationship between attitude and behavior. The problem remains to establish how one affects the other. In Penfield to date, the issue of the transfer program has not become sufficiently salient to translate negative attitudes into openly negative behavior, perhaps, in part, because of the strong factors of social desirability operating within the

district. The question remains , what factors or events might alter this. To date attitudes of active or passive support for or even passive rejection of the transfer program have permitted its rather smoothe and non-controversial operation.

III. Community Setting

An integral part of this survey of Penfield's long-term reaction to the transfer program is a general analysis of related events within the district and county. To this end the two Penfield weeklies plus the Rochester papers were carefully scanned for information pertinent to the transfer program.

Housing, zoning, taxes and schools are the major topics of concern in Penfield as evidenced by the newspapers. The shortage and high cost of housing in Penfield concerns many district residents. A major issue discussed at length during 1968-69 was building moderate income housing. The proposed construction of 130 units of moderate income housing ($5000-8000 yearly income limits) in Penfield touched off much debate with opposition focusing on the issues of increased traffic problems, reduced property values and spot zoning. It was impossible to discover what role fear of racial integration played in the opposition to this proposal; the issue remain unstated throughout the debate.

Tawes provided a second continuing topic of concern for residents. In 1969 town and county tax rates rose $18.73. This provoked sharp debate. The 1970 rate held the line with moderate increases. The issue of finance seems increasingly to dominate school related problems within the district. Despite the statewide trend of a 'taxpayer's revolt' Penfield's budget passed easily the first time both in June 1969

and June 1970.

However, the Penfield school district submitted a bond issue proposal to expand high school facilities to district voters three times during 1969. Each time it was rejected.

Date	Turnout	Actual Vote	Outcome
2/69	37.5%	2479 -1270	defeated
10/69	30.0%	1559 -1446	defeated
12/69	40.3%	2301 -1700	defeated

In June 1969 elections were held for two school board positions. Only one challenger emerged who publicly attempted to make an issue of the transfer program. He was readily defeated. In the June 1970 board elections, the transfer program was not mentioned as an issue.

As previously reported the transfer program does not seem to be an issue of any real substance in Penfield. The Penfield papers have devoted very little space to the transfer program and readers have contributed very few letters on the topic. The program was not a topic of concern either during budget or board elections except as previously indicated. In later summer 1969 a report was presented to the board by a BOCES consultant. This report evaluated the educational and social results in the classroom of the program during its first year. It concluded that: Penfield students performed academically as well as they would have without the program; the program did not seem to make major differences in the academic performances of the Rochester students; and that socially the city students seemed to be accepted. These results were reviewed at length in the papers but no editorializing or reader reaction followed. The board has approved continuation of the program for 1969-70 and 1970-71.

IV. Review of the Literature

A detailed review of the literature on school integration reveals the real paucity of reliable information about attitudes about school integration.* To date the primary focus of research seems to have centered around the process of integration within the classroom. Many more general articles deal with racial prejudice. However, with the increasing knowledge and sophistication, particularly of a well educated, white, upper middle class, suburban population, the reliability of these articles and the research format upon which they are based becomes suspect.

A few studies have begun to deal with the problem of community reaction to school integration. Agger and deBerry's study of "School and Race in Portlane" is one of the best efforts. More limited efforts at investigating community attitudes towards school integration have come from the White Plains and Syracuse programs. Berkeley residents were carefully surveyed five years before the school board implemented its major integration plan; there is no indication of any follow-up to this study. Both the Riverside and Ann Arbor school districts are currently involved in examining community attitudes and reactions to their integration programs; no results have been reported. All of the above-mentioned studies deal with within-city transfer programs.

Only three of the functioning suburban-urban transfer programs have probed and reported on community attitudes towards the programs. These include: West Irondequoit,[1] Park,[2] and Hartford.[3] In West Irondequoit mailed questionnaires were sent to two groups, parents and the community

* See appendix B.

1. "A Citizen's Committee Evaluation of the Intercultural Enrichment Program in West Irondequoit after Four Years", February 1969.
2. B.W.Swanson, C. Montgomery, "White Citizen Response to the Open Enrollment Program," in Integrated Education.
3. T. Mahan, "Project Concern: a two year report," August 1968.

at large. Parents favored the program slightly, the community by a 20% margin. The West Irondequoit survey raises serious doubts about methodology and represents only a very general indication of community reaction.

The Park study was carried out in 1963 and only generally reported in 1964. In socio-economic characteristics Park resembles Penfield. The study is based on a questionnaire left with every fifth family and picked up a week later; response rate was 73%. The results indicate strong opposition to the program although 85% favored integrated education in theory. The questionnaire probed respondents views of the program and the reported comments are similar to those in the Penfield survey.

Mahan's review of parental response to the Hartford transfer program is the most extensive and valuable reported to date. The results are based on returns from a mailed questionnaire (44% return) to residents of three participating suburbs. Respondents favored continuation by 50.5% to 23.5% with 26.1% undecided. Other questions asked by Mahan include: whether children talked about the city students at home and their comments and satisfaction with information available about the program. This study does not probe respondents' attitudes towards the schools or the program deeply enough to produce anything other than an indication of general support for the program.

In conclusion, suburban-urban transfer programs are a relatively new device to alleviate the problem of de facto segregation. As such, few have been carefully studied; those that have have focused on within classroom progress and measures. In that community reaction to suburban-urban transfer programs is a vital element in their continuation, this

variable requires further investigation. Also, since suburbs are often segregated communities, knowledge of the impact of such programs upon receiving communities is important to understanding the process of racial interaction and attitude formation.

Appendix A: Background Data

Number of Years Residing in School District

	0 to 1 year	1 to 3 years	4 to 8 years	8 or more years	other
Total	7.3%	25%	29.7%	36.3%	1.7%

Educational Levels

	H.S. incomplete	H.S. complete	College incomplete	College complete	Beyond College	M.A.	Ph.D M.D etc.	Other
Husband	4.5%	15.9%	15.3%	32.3%	7.3%	11.9	9.6%	2.8%
Wife	5.1%	27.8%	28.3%	26.7%	5.6%	5.1%	0.5%	0.6%

Occupational status - husband

	Technical or Skilled	Manager	Self Employed	semi-Skilled or Laborer	Sales man	Profes-sional	Gov. Worker or Teacher	Other
Total	30.1%	25.1%	10.7%	4.5%	9.1%	10.2%	5%	5%

Occupational status - wife

	At home	Second income	Sole support of family	Other
Total	71%	24.6%	2.2%	1.7%

Income	other	$0 to 5000	$5 - 7500	$7500- 10,000	$10 - 15,000	$15 - 20,000	$20,000+
Total.....	3.5%	1.4%	4.3%	7.9%	33.6%	27.9%	21.4%
At large..	2.2	2.8	4.5	10.3	39.8	25.0	15.9
Parent....	6.0	-	6.2	6.2	33.3	24.2	24.2
Elite.....	5.3	-	-	-	5.3	47.4	42.1

APPENDIX B : BIBLIOGRAPHY

books:

Brink, W. and L. Harris, Black and White: a Study of U.S. Racial Attitudes Today, Simon and Schuster, 1967.

Bourma, D.H. and J. Hoffman, The Dynamics of School Integration, Eerdmans, 1968.

Campbell, Roald et al eds., Education and Urban Renaissance, J. Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Crain, RL., The Politics of School Desegregation, Aldine Publishing, 1968

Daly, C.Y., ed., The Quality of Inequality: Urban and Suburban Public Schools, Chicago, 1968

Damerell, R.G., Triumph in a White Suburb, Morrow, 1968.

Dentler, R.A., B. Mackler and M.E. Warshauer, The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education, Praeger, 1968.

Fantini, Mario and G. Weinstein, Making Urban Schools Work: Social Realities and the Urban School, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969

Gittell, M. and J. Hoffman, Educating an Urban Population: Implications for public policy, Sage, 1967.

Gittell, M. and A.G. Hevesi, eds., The Politics of Urban Education, Praeger, 1969.

Gittell, M. and T.E. Hollander, Six Urban School Districts: a Comparative Study of Institutional Response, Praeger, 1968.

Hill, R., and M. Feeley, eds., Affirmative School Integration: Efforts to Overcome de facto Segregation in Urban Schools, Sage, 1968.

Linton, T.E., and J.L. Nelson, eds., Patterns of Power: Social Foundations of Education, Pitman, 1968.

McKelvey, T.V., and A.D. Swanson, eds., Urban School Administration, Sage, 1968.

Meranto, P., The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: a Study in Political Innovation, Syracuse, 1969

Rosenthal, A., Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics Syracuse, 1968.

Toffler, Alvin, ed., The Schoolhouse in the City, Praeger, 1968.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

books: (con't)

Wirt, F.M. and T.B. Edwards, eds., School Desegregation in the North, Chandler, 1967.

Zimmer, B.G. and A.H. Hawley, Metropolitan Area Schools, Resistance to District Reorganization, Sage, 1969.

JOURNALS

American Education

1967, H. Spergel, "Busing Kids to the Suburbs: Boston's METCO Program"
1968, M. Chester, et al, "What Happens When Northern Schools Desegregate?"

Contemporary Education

1968, W. Elrod, "Effect of Persuasive Communication on Interracial Attitudes"

Daedalus

vol. 94, T.F. Pettigrew, "Complexity and Change in American Patterns: A Social Psychological View"
vol. 95, J.H. Fischer, "Race and Reconciliation: the Role of the School"
P. Sheatsley, "White Attitudes toward the Negro"

Educational Leadership

1968, A. Adkins, "Inequities Between Suburban and Urban Schools," bibliography

Education and Urban Society

1968, M. Gittell, "Urban School Reform in the 1970's"
1969, D.K. Cohen, "School Resources and Racial Equality"
B.E. Swanson, "Psycho-Political Patterns of School Desegregation: Mt. Vernon, N.Y."
P. Meranto, "School Desegregation, Urban and Suburban"
B.E. Swanson, E. Cortin, E. Main, "Parents in Search of Community Influence in the Public Schools"

Education Forum

1967, B.C. Arnstine, "Role of Attitudes in Schooling"

Elementary School Journal

1968, C.H. Troupe, "Whittier, Somerset Project: a Case Study in Urban-Suburban School Cooperation"

Harvard Education Review

vol. 33, the entire "Special Issue" is devoted to problems of school integration
1963 R.J. Light, R.L. Green, "Report analysis: National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders", bibliography

Instructor

1963, "Principal's Problem: Busing Children out of Negro Schools"
1969, "Is Busing the Answer?"

Integrated Education

1963, "Two Cities Evaluate Busing: New York and St. Louis"
1964, B. Swanson, C. Montgomery, "White Citizen Response to Open Enrollment"
G.S. Lesser et al, "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools"
1965, T.G. Wolman, "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle"
R.E. Agger and C. De Berry, "School and Race in Portland"
1966, H.R. Goldberg, "Metropolitan Planning for Education"
N. Kurland et al, "Urban-Sururban Cooperation: a Report"
1969, T.F. Pettigrew, "Racially Separate or Together?"
1970, A.M. Mahan, T.W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: an Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children"

Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology

1948, B. Mackenzie, "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes Towards Negroes"
1965, D.D. Stein, J.A. Hardyck, M.B. Smith, "Race and Belief: an Open and Shut Case"
H.C. Triandis, E.E. Davis, "Race and Belief as Determinants of Behavioral Intentions"

Journal of Human Relations

1966, B. Watson, "The Backlash of White Supremacy: Caste Status and the Negro Revolt"

Journal of Negro Education

1965, R.A. Dentler, "Community Behavior and Northern School Desegregation"
D.W. Dodson, "School Administration, Control and Public Policy"
M.M. Grossack, "Psychological Considerations Essential to Effective Educational Integration"
1968, T.P. Carter, N. Hickerson, "A California Citizens' Committee Studies its Schools and Desegregation"
E.E. Harris, "Prejudice and Other Social Factors in School Segregation"
T. Mahan, "The Busing of Students for Equal Opportunities"
1969, N. Glazer, "Ethnic Groups and Education: Towards the Tolerance of Difference", bibliography

Journal of Secondary Education

1967, R.L. Sweigert, Jr., "Polling Community Opinion on Educational Matters"

Law and Society Review

1967, "Affirmative Integration: Studies of Efforts to Overcome de facto Segregation in the Public Schools", a survey of events in Berkeley and Evanston

Michigan Education

1966, U. Auld, "Lansing Busing Meets Roadblock"

Nation's Schools

1967, C.O. Richter, S.F. Overlan, "Will suburban-urban Busing Work:"
R.J. Havighurst, "These Integration Approaches Work Sometimes; Desegregation Efforts in Cities Across the Country"
1968, A. Cohodes, "Can a Conservative Suburb Desegregate Comfortably?"
A. Cohodes, "Chicago Board Vacillates but Finally Agrees to Bus"
"Nearly Three out of Four Frown on Busing for Desegregation: School Administrators' Opinion Poll"

New York State Education

1967, W.T. Callahan, "Suburban School District Decides to Move on de facto Segregation"

Phi Delta Kappan

1967, H. Singer, I.G. Hendrick, "Total School Integration: an Experiment in Social Reconstruction"
1969, M.M. Milstein, D.E. Hoch, "Landmark in School Racial Integration: Berkeley, California"

Phylon

1965, I. Black, "Race and Unreason: Anti-Negro Opinion in Professional and Scientific Literature since 1954"
R.W. Hanes, W.S. Bynarm, "The Effect of a Voluntary Community Improvement Program on Local Race Relations"

Public Opinion Quarterly

1965, M. Olsen, "Alienation and Political Opinions"
1966, M. Rokeach, "Attitude Change and Behavioral Change"
1967, C.H. Smith, "Correcting for Social Desirability Response Sets in Opinion-Attitude Survey Research"
C.L. Willis, "Analysis of Voter Response to School Financial Proposals"
1968, B.S. Dohrenwend, J. Colombotos, B.P. Dohrenwend, "Social Distance and Interviewer Effects"

Public Opinion Quarterly (con't)

1963, B. Frisbie, S. Sudman, "The Use of Computers in Coding Free Responses"
M. Rokeach, "The Role of Values in Public Opinion Research"

School and Society

1966, S.A. Moore, S.L. Woodard, "School Desegregation: Localism or Metropolitanism?"
1968, C. Hamilton, "White Communities not Ready for Integrated Schools"
1969, L.T. Cagle, "School Busing and Parental Anxiety"

School Management

1967, M. Buskin, "CITY TO SUBURB Busing"
M. Buskin, "Problem: Influx of Middle-Class Negroes into a Suburban Community"
M. Buskin, "Problem: Selling an Integration Plan to a Community: Evanston, Illinois"
M. Buskin, "Problem: How to Integrate a 5000 Student Suburban School System: Inkster, Michigan"
1968, D. Wegars, "Berkeley, California: When the Buses Began to Roll"
1969, M. Buskin, "City to Suburb Busing: What Next for Great Neck?"

School Review, The

1965, B.E. Swanson, "Subcommunity Response to City-wide School Policies: Measuring White-Parents Decisions on School Pairing"
1966, L.A. Marascuilo, K. Penfield, "A Northern Urban Community's Attitudes towards Racial Imbalance in Schools and Classrooms"

Scientific American

1964, H.H. Hyman, P.B. Sheatsley, "Attitudes Towards Desegregation"

Social Forces

1961, R.W. Greenfield, "Factors Associated with Attitudes Towards Desegregation in a Florida Residential Suburb"
1966-67, H.M. Bahr, J.P. Gibbs, "Racial Differentiation in American Metropolitan Areas"
E. Freedmen and B. Meer, "The Impact of Negro Neighbors on White Home Owners"
J.S. Himes, "The Functions of Racial Conflict"
D.W. Johnson, "Racial Attitudes of Negro Freedom School Participants and Negro and White Civil Rights Participants"

Sociological Inquiry

1965, K. Lang, G. Lang, "Resistance to School Desegregation: a Case Study of Backlash Among Jews"
D. Rogers, B. Swanson, "White Citizen Response to the Same Integration Plan: Comparisons of Local School Districts in a Northern City"

Sociology of Education

1964, N.D. Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation"
1966, N.D. Glenn, "The Trend in Differences in Attitudes and Behavior by Educational Level"
1967, B.G. Zimmer, A.H. Hawley, "Factors Associated with Resistance to the Organization of Metropolitan Area Schools"

Today's Educator

1969, Research divison, N.E.A., "Busing: Teacher Opinion Poll"

Urban Affairs Quarterly

1968, T. Dye, "Urban School Segregation:a Comparative Analysis"

Urban Education

1969, L.T. Cagle, J. Beker, "School Desegregation in a Norther City: Parental Perceptions of Sending and Host Elementary Schools"

Western Reserve Law Review

1965, S. Peck and D.K. Cohen, "The Social Context of de facto School Segregation"

mimeographed publications:

Ann Arbor, Michigan

Carrigan, Patricia M., "School Desegregation via Compulsory Pupil Transfer: Its Effects on Elementary School Pupils" proposal to USOE by Public Schools of the City of Ann Arbor, 1965
Carrigan, Patricia M., "Jones School Reassignment Project: Family Questionnaire", Ann Arbor Public Schools, Summer, 1966, no results reported

Berkeley, California

Berkeley Unified School District, Speakers Fact Sheet
Berkeley Unified School District, Releases of January 17, 1968 and August 30, 1968
Berkeley Unified School District, "Integration: a Plan for Berkeley" October 3, 1967, a report to the Board

Hartford, Conneticut

Mahan, Thomas W., "Project Concern: a Two Year Report", Hartford Public Schools, August 1963.

New York City

Fox, David J., "Evaluation of N.Y.C. Title I Educational Projects 1966-67. Expansion of the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program" N.Y.: Center for Urban Education, September 1967
Fox, David J., "Expansion of the More Effective School Program" N.Y.: Center for Urban Education, September 1967

Penfield, New York

Penfield Central School District, "Evaluation Report, Penfield Urban-Suburban Transfer Program", July 1969
Penfield Central School District, "Human Relations Committee", a Report, May 1969

Philadelphia, Pa.,

Laird, M.A., and G.J. Weeks, "The Effect of Busing on Achievement in in Reading and Arithmetic in Three Philadelphia Schools", School District of Philadelphia, December 1966

Riverside, California

Riverside Unified School District and University of California, Riverside, "Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement in Racially Desegregated Public Schools", study conducted from June 1967-May 1972, E. Raymond Berry, Robert R. Hewitt, Harold B. Gerard, Norman Miller, Harry Singer
Harold B. Gerard, "Factors Contributing to Adjustment and Achievement" a progress report, May 1968, Riverside School Study

Rochester, New York

William Rock, et al., "An Interim Report on a Cooperative Program Between a City School District and a Suburban School District", Rochester City School District, July 1967

Syracuse, New York

Jerome Beker, "A Study of Integration in Racially Imbalanced Urban Schools - A Demonstration Evaluation" A final report. Syracuse, N.Y. 1967
Larrence Cagle, J. Beker, "A Comparison of the Social Characteristics and Educational Aspirations of Northern, Lower Class, Negro Parents Who Accepted and Declined an Opportunity for Integrated Education for their Children", Syracuse University, Youth Development Center, 1966

West Irondequoit, New York

West Irondequoit School District, "Intercultural Culture Teacher Questionnaire-Results", (date of administration, 9/7/65)
"A Citizens' Committee Evaluation of the Intercultural Enrichment Program in West Irondequoit After Four Years", February 1969
Hapemen, C.F., "Teacher and Administrator Evaluations of the West Irondequoit Inter-Cultural Enrichment Program," Spring 1967

White Plains, New York

Johnson, Carroll F., "White Plains Racial Balance Plan", White Plains Public Schools, July 1967

White Plains Public Schools, "A Three year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan", October 1967

other:

St. John, Nancy, N. Smith, "First Draft of Annotated Bibliography on School Racial Mix and the Self Concept, Aspirations, Academic Achievement and Interracial Attitudes and Behavior of Negro Children", Harvard Graduate School of Education, Spring 1966

Matthai, Robert, "The Academic Performance of Negro Students: an Analysis of The Research Findings from Several Busing Programs", Harvard Graduate School of Education, June 1968

ERIC materials

I.G. Hendrick, "The Development of a School Integration Plan in Riverside California: a History and Perspective", 1969 ED 028 210

R.L. Crain, "Educational Decisionmaking and the Distribution of Influence in the cities", 1969, ED 025 023

D. Wilder et al, "Actual and Perceived Consensus on Educational Goals Between School and Community", a final report, 1969, ED 023 939

R.W. Pranis, D.J. Horsbach, "The Parent Survey, Report of Findings", 1969, ED 022 195

A.E. Myers, "Factors Relating to the Acceptance of Negro Children in a Busing Integration Program", 1969, ED 021 925

"Parent Action in School Integration: A New York Experience", 1969, ED 023 710

"How Evanston Illinois Integrated all of its Schools", 1969, ED 023 740

L.A. Marascuilo, "Attitudes Toward de facto Segregation in a Northern City", 1965, ED 003 325

J.S. Coleman, "Race Relaiions and Social Change"; 1965, ED 013 493